

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 16, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of the claims. The withdrawal of the previous grounds of rejection is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the grounds that they were considered to be unpatentable over the *Ieki et al.* patent (US 5,204,512), in view of the *Chen et al.* patent (US 5,694,471) and the *Bosen et al.* patent (US 5,060,263), all of which were newly cited. Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 on the basis of these three patents, in further view of the previously-cited *Drupsteen et al.* patent. For the reasons presented below, it is respectfully submitted that these patents do not suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art, whether they are considered individually or in combination.

As briefly described in Applicant's previous response, the claimed invention is directed to the management of data stored in a smart card, and is particularly concerned with the transfer of data from one card to another. Access to the data in each card is controlled by a respective management code, which is based upon a secret code that is entered by the user, such as a password or a PIN. In accordance with the present invention, a management code for the new card is generated on the basis of information relating to the old card. For instance, as depicted in Figure 2 of the application, the management code 14 for the first card is based upon a mother key 100 and the serial number 12 of the first card. This serial number is also stored on the second card 2, along with its own serial number 23. The algorithm 21 for calculating the management code 22

of the second card receives, as inputs, the serial number 23 of the second card and data relating to the first card, such as its serial number 12 and/or its management code 14.

The rejection of claim 1 alleges that the *Ieki* patent discloses most of the features recited in the claim. Among these features, the Office Action states that "data relating to the first card and the second management code are recorded in a second memory of a second chip of the second chip card," with reference to column 4, lines 38-46 and 62-67 of the *Ieki* patent. While these portions of the patent indicate that a code number is stored within the second card IC-2, Applicant cannot find any teaching that this second card also stores "data relating to the first card," as recited in claim 1. Rather, it appears that the two cards IC-1 and IC-2 are independent of one another, particularly with respect to the passwords or code numbers required to obtain access to protected data.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the *Ieki* patent does not disclose all of the claimed features that are alleged in the Office Action.

Another feature of the invention that is recited in claim 1 is that the second management code is "based on data relating to the first card and a second set of identification data of a second chip card." Similar subject matter is recited in new claim 14. The Office Action acknowledges that neither of the *Ieki* nor *Chen* patents discloses such a feature, and relies upon the teachings of the *Bosen* patent to supply this missing element. The *Bosen* patent discloses a computer access control system which employs dynamic passwords. Unlike a static password system, in which the user enters the same password each time that protected data is to be accessed, a dynamic password system requires the user to enter a different password each time that access to a given computer system is requested. The *Bosen* patent teaches that the new password is computed by

encrypting the previous password in a number of steps, as depicted in the table appearing at column 7, lines 40-47. In this type of system, therefore, the new password replaces the previous password each time the protected data is accessed on the computer system.

Unlike the present invention, the *Bosen* patent does not relate to a situation in which the password for access to data stored in a *second device*, such as a smart card, is based on data relating to a *different, first device*. In the context of the present invention, the first and second management codes can *both* be active at any given time, for access to the data stored in their respective first and second cards.

In contrast, the *Bosen* patent only relates to the generation of a password for a *given* device. The patent does not disclose, nor otherwise relate to, the computation of a password for a *second* device, based upon the password of a first device. Rather, the technique disclosed in that patent only pertains to the computation of a *new* password for the given device to replace the previously-used password. Only one password is active at any particular time.

At best, therefore, when the teachings of the *Bosen* patent are applied to the combined disclosures of the *Ieki* and *Chen* patents, the logical result would be to employ dynamic password protection in place of the static password protection, for a given IC card. There is no suggestion, however, in any of the references that the password, or other access control code, for a *second* IC card should be based upon data relating to the first card. As noted above, the *Ieki* patent discloses that the password protection data of the two cards is independent of one another, and there is nothing in either the *Chen* or the *Bosen* patents that suggests modifying this teaching in a manner that would result in the claimed subject matter.

For at least the foregoing reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the *Ieki*, *Chen* and *Bosen* patents, even when considered in combination, do not suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 or 14. In addition, other differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are set forth in various dependent claims. In view of the foregoing distinctions, however, further discussion of these additional differences is not believed to be warranted at this time.


Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: September 16, 2004

By: _____



James A. LaBarre

Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620